arXiv:1301.4378v2 [math.AP] 23 Jan 2013

A NOTE ON TYPE I BLOW UP FORMATION FOR THE CRITICAL NLW.

JOACHIM KRIEGER, WILLIE WONG

Abstract. We prove development of type I singularities for a suitable concept of weak evolution in the context of the quintic focussing NLW on $\mathbb{R}^{3+1}$, for data near and "above" the ground state static solution.

1. Introduction

We consider the critical focussing nonlinear wave equation on $\mathbb{R}^{3+1}$, given by

$$\Box u := -u_{tt} + \triangle u = -u^5\,, \tag{1.1}$$

which has a (possibly negative) conserved energy

$$E(u) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Big(\frac{1}{2}(u_t^2 + |\nabla_x u|^2) - \frac{u^6}{6}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,.$$

We restrict to radial solutions of the form $u(t,x) = v(t,|x|)$. It is well-known and easy to show that this model admits finite time blow up solutions, and in fact one has the explicit ODE-type solutions

$$u(t,x) = \frac{(\frac{3}{4})^{\frac{1}{4}}}{(T-t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

for any $T \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume now $T > 0$. By truncation to a backward (or forward) light cone and invocation of Huygens' principle, one can modify these to solutions for which the free energy, defined as

$$E_{\text{free}}(u)(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \Big[\frac{1}{2}(u_t^2 + |\nabla_x u|^2)\Big]\,\mathrm{d}x\,,$$

is finite for times t before the blow up time T. Indeed, one may consider data $u[0] = \big(u(0,\cdot), u_t(0,\cdot)\big)$ with

$$u(0,\cdot) = \chi_{|x|<3T}\frac{(\frac{3}{4})^{\frac{1}{4}}}{T^{\frac{1}{2}}}\,,\quad u_t(0,\cdot) = \chi_{|x|<3T}\frac{(\frac{3}{64})^{\frac{1}{4}}}{T^{\frac{3}{2}}}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35L05, 35B44.

Key words and phrases. critical wave equation, hyperbolic dynamics, blowup, scattering, stability, invariant manifold.

Support of the Swiss National Fund for the first author is gratefully acknowledged.

where the cutoff function $\chi_{|x|<3T}|_{|x|\leqslant 2T} = 1$ and smoothly truncates to the region $|x| < 3T$. Observe that these solutions satisfy

$$\limsup_{t\nearrow T} E_{\text{free}}(u)(t) = +\infty\,,$$

i.e. these solutions are *of type I*. By contrast one also defines a singular solution to be of *type II*, provided as we approach the maximum forward time of existence T

$$\limsup_{t\nearrow T} E_{\text{free}}(u)(t) < +\infty\,.$$

Recent works by Duyckaerts-Kenig-Merle [3–6] have provided a complete classification near the blow-up time of type II solutions for (1.1), while existence of solutions of this type was established in [11] and [1]. Here, we would like to discuss the formation of type I blow up. To the best of the authors' knowledge, previously demonstrated type I blow up mechanisms all derive in principle from u_t having a sign pointwise. In addition to the explicit ODE solutions (and perturbations thereof as in [2]), Duyckaerts-Kenig-Merle showed in [5] that monotonicity in time of a radial solution close to the blow up time implies type I blow up, which they then used to show that the W^+ solution of [7] as well as solutions given by initial data $u[0] = (cW, 0)$ with $c > 1$ all evolve into type I blow ups.

In a recent work [10], the study of all possible dynamics which result as *perturbations of the static solution* $W(x) = \left(1 + \frac{|x|^2}{3}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ was begun. Note that these static solutions are a special feature of the energy critical case. Also, crucially for the analysis of [10], the perturbations are close to W with respect to a norm strictly stronger than the energy. It was then shown in [10] that there exists a co-dimension one Lipschitz manifold $\mathcal{S}$ passing through W such that within a sufficiently close neighborhood to W, data 'above' $\mathcal{S}$ result in finite time blow up while data 'below' $\mathcal{S}$ scatter to zero, all in forward time. Further, data precisely located on $\mathcal{S}$ lead so solutions in forward time scattering toward a re-scaling of W.

In this note, we would like to study the finite-time blow up solutions corresponding to data slightly above $\mathcal{S}$. Conjecturally, a generic set within these solutions ought to correspond to type I blow up solutions. At this time we cannot show this. Instead, our goal here is to introduce a suitable concept of *canonical weak solution* and show that such solutions will result eventually, in finite time, in a type I blow up scenario. This will be seen to directly result from a combination of the recent breakthrough characterization of type II blow up solutions by Duyckaerts-Kenig-Merle [6] with the techniques developed in [9].

2. A CANONICAL CONCEPT OF WEAK EVOLUTION

Let $u(t, x)$ be a (radial) Shatah-Struwe energy class solution (see e.g. [13], [8]) of (1.1), existing on an interval $I = [0, T)$, $T > 0$. Also, assume that I is a maximal such interval. If $T < \infty$, then the solution either has a type I singularity at T, or else a type II singularity. Assume the latter situation. According to the seminal work [6], the solution admits a decomposition (writing $W_\lambda(x) = \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} W(\lambda x)$ for the

$\dot{H}^1$ invariant scaling)

$$u(t,\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \kappa_i W_{\lambda_i(t)}(\cdot) + u_1(t,\cdot) + o_{\dot{H}^1}(1), \quad \kappa_i \in \{\pm 1\},$$
$$u_t(t,\cdot) = u_{1,t}(t,\cdot) + o_{L^2}(1)$$

as $t \nearrow T$, with[1]

$$(T-t)^{-1} \ll \lambda_1(t) \ll \lambda_2(t) \ll \ldots \ll \lambda_N(t)$$

and $u_1(t,\cdot)$ is an energy class solution of (1.1) in a neighborhood around time $t = T$. One easily verifies that this $u_1(t,\cdot)$ is indeed uniquely determined by u and T. It is then natural, assuming that there is a type II singularity at time $t = T$, to continue the evolution past time T by imposing data

$$u[T] = \big(u(T,\cdot), u_t(T,\cdot)\big) := \big(u_1(T,\cdot), u_{1,t}(T,\cdot)\big)$$

and then using the Shatah-Struwe evolution of $u[T]$ starting from time $T =: T_1$. Then there exists $T_2 \in (T_1, +\infty]$, such that if $T_2 < \infty$, there is either a type I or type II singularity at T_2, and then in the latter case again the Duyckaerts-Kenig-Merle profile decomposition applies at time $t = T_2$, allowing us to write

$$u(t,\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_2} \kappa_i^{(2)} W_{\lambda_i^{(2)}(t)}(\cdot) + u_2(t,\cdot) + o_{\dot{H}^1}(1), \ \ t \nearrow T_2,$$

where u_2 is now a solution of (1.1) in a neighborhood containing $t = T_2$. In this way, we obtain a sequence of times

$$T_1 < T_2 < T_3 < \ldots, \ T_i \in (0, +\infty]$$

with the following possibilities: (i) the sequence is finite, and the last $T_{\text{terminal}} := T_N = +\infty$, with all previous T_i being type II blow up times; (ii) the sequence is finite, and the last $T_{\text{terminal}} := T_N < \infty$ being the first type I blow up time in the evolution; (iii) the sequence is infinite and we define $T_{\text{terminal}} := \lim_{i\to\infty} T_i \in (0,\infty]$. Note that that except in case (ii) we have no *a priori* knowledge as to whether the solution blows up at T_{terminal}.

We now define the *canonical evolution* of the data $u[0]$ on $[0, T_{\text{terminal}})$ to be the function $\tilde{u}(t,\cdot)$ given by $u(t,\cdot)$ on $[0, T_1)$, by $u_1(t,\cdot)$ on $[T_1, T_2)$ etc.

On the other hand, we define $u(t,x) \in L^\infty([0,T_*), \dot{H}^1) \cap W^{1,\infty}([0,T_*), L^2)$ to be a *weak solution* of (1.1), provided for every $\phi \in C_0^\infty((-\infty, T_*) \times \mathbb{R}^3)$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_t(0,\cdot)\phi(0,\cdot)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_0^{T_*}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \big(u_t\phi_t - \nabla_x u \cdot \nabla_x \phi\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t = -\int_0^{T_*}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^5\phi\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t\,. \quad (2.1)$$

---

[1] The notation $a(t) \ll b(t)$ here means $\lim_{t\nearrow T} \frac{b(t)}{a(t)} = +\infty$.

Note that our concept of canonical weak evolution is in fact more regular than $L^\infty([0,T_*),\dot{H}^1)\cap W^{1,\infty}([0,T_*),L^2)$, since

$$\tilde{u}|_{[T_{i-1},T_i)}\in C^0\big([T_{i-1},T_i),\dot{H}^1\big)\cap C^1\big([T_{i-1},T_i),L^2\big).$$

In particular, for the canonical evolution $\tilde{u}$ is right-continuous at time 0, that is $\lim_{t\searrow 0}\tilde{u}(t,\cdot)=u(0,\cdot)$ with respect to $\dot{H}^1$. Then

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\tilde{u}(t,\cdot)$ be the canonical evolution of $u[0]\in\dot{H}^1\times L^2$, defined on $[0,T_{terminal})$. Then $\tilde{u}$ is a weak solution of* (1.1) *in the above sense with $T_*=T_{terminal}$.*

Proof. Let $\phi\in C_0^\infty((-\infty,T_{\text{terminal}})\times\mathbb{R}^3)$. Then recalling the construction of $\tilde{u}$, there exist finitely many T_i, $i=1,2,\dots,k$, $T_0:=0$, with $T_i\in\pi_t(\text{supp}(\phi))$ with $\pi_t:\mathbb{R}^{3+1}\to\mathbb{R}$ the projection onto the time coordinate. Then we have $\tilde{u}|_{[T_i,T_{i+1})}=u_i$, $u_0=u$ being the evolution of the data $u[0]$. Now for each i, pick a function $\chi\in C_0^\infty([T_i,T_{i+1}))$ with $\chi(T_i)=1$; then integrating by parts the Shatah-Struwe energy class solution u_i we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}u_{i,t}(T_i,\cdot)\phi(T_i,\cdot)\,\mathrm{d}x+\int_{T_i}^{T_{i+1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\big(u_{i,t}(\chi\phi)_t-\nabla_x u_i\cdot\nabla_x(\chi\phi)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t$$
$$=-\int_{T_i}^{T_{i+1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}u_i^5\chi\phi\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t \qquad (2.2)$$

Pick a sequence $\chi^{(k)}\in C_0^\infty([T_i,T_{i+1}))$ with $\chi^{(k)}\to\chi_{[T_i,T_{i+1})}$ pointwise and locally uniformly and such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{T_i}^{T_{i+1}}(\chi^{(k)})'(t)f(t)\,dt=-f(T_{i+1})$$

for $f\in C^0([T_i,T_{i+1}])$. Since we can write (as $t\nearrow T_{i+1}$ and where $\kappa_k^{(i)}\in\{\pm1\}$)

$$u_i(t,\cdot)\xrightarrow{\dot{H}^1}\sum_{k=1}^{N_i}\kappa_k^{(i)}W_{\lambda_k^{(i)}(t)}(\cdot)+u_{i+1}(t,\cdot),\qquad u_{i,t}\xrightarrow{L^2}u_{i+1,t}(T_{i+1},\cdot),$$

we infer

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{T_i}^{T_{i+1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\big(u_{i,t}(\chi^{(k)}\phi)_t-\nabla_x u_i\cdot\nabla_x(\chi^{(k)}\phi)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t$$
$$=\int_{T_i}^{T_{i+1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\big(u_{i,t}\phi_t-\nabla_x u_i\cdot\nabla_x(\phi)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t-\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}u_{i+1,t}(T_{i+1},\cdot)\phi(T_{i+1},\cdot)\,\mathrm{d}x$$

and so we obtain

$$\int_{T_i}^{T_{i+1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\big(u_{i,t}\phi_t-\nabla_x u_i\cdot\nabla_x(\phi)\big)\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_{T_i}^{T_{i+1}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}u_i^5\phi\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}t$$
$$=\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}u_{i+1,t}(T_{i+1},\cdot)\phi(T_{i+1},\cdot)\,\mathrm{d}x-\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}u_{i,t}(T_i,\cdot)\phi(T_i,\cdot)\,\mathrm{d}x. \qquad (2.3)$$

Summation of the relations (2.3) over $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$, we find the relation

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{u}_t(0,\cdot)\phi(0,\cdot)\,dx + \int_0^{T_{\text{terminal}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \left(\tilde{u}_t\phi_t - \nabla_x\tilde{u}\cdot\nabla_x\phi\right) dxdt \\ &= -\int_0^{T_{\text{terminal}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{u}^5\phi\, dxdt,\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

proving the lemma. □

3. Formation of type I singularities

Observe that the solutions constructed in [11], when time-translated to commence at $t = 0$, satisfy $T_1 > 0$, $T_2 = +\infty$, in the notation of the preceding section. In this paper we seek to address whether there exist generic sets of solutions which satisfy $T_{\text{terminal}} < +\infty$. (Recall that by definition, if $T_{\text{terminal}} < +\infty$, then it is either (1) the supremum of an infinite sequence of bounded type II blow-up times or (2) the first type I blow-up time after at most a finite number of type II blow-ups.) We have

Theorem 3.1. *Let $u(t,\cdot)$ be one of the blow up solutions constructed in [10], corresponding to data slightly above $\mathcal{S}$, the latter also as in [10]. Then the canonical weak extension of this solution in the sense of the preceding section will satisfy $T_{terminal} < +\infty$. Furthermore, the canonical weak solutions satisfy*

$$\limsup_{t\nearrow T_{terminal}} E_{free}(\tilde{u})(t) = +\infty\,. \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. We first observe that in either scenario (1) or (2), the "type I" condition (3.1) is necessarily satisfied. This is immediate for scenario (2), while we have (using the notation from the preceding section) from conservation of energy and the asymptotic separation of the profiles $\lambda_k^{(i)}(t)$ that

$$E(u_i) = N_i \cdot E(W) + E(u_{i+1})\,, \qquad N_i \geqslant 1$$

since the soliton energy is scale invariant. We evaluate

$$E(W) = \frac{1}{3}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla W|^2\,\mathrm{d}x > 0$$

and so $\lim_{i\to\infty} E(u_i) = -\infty$, which from Sobolev's embedding implies

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \|\nabla_{t,x} u_i(T_i,\cdot)\|_{L^2_x} = +\infty\,.$$

It remains to rule out the possibility that $T_{\text{terminal}} = +\infty$. From the definition this requires either $T_k = +\infty$ for some finite k, or $\lim_{i\to\infty} T_i = +\infty$ for an infinite sequence of type II blow-up times T_i. The former case is straightforward to rule out for $k \geqslant 3$: note that this corresponds to

$$u_{k-1}[T_{k-1}]$$

admitting a global in forward time Shatah-Struwe type solution. However, observe that

$$E(u_2) \leqslant E(u) - 2E(W) < -E(W) + \varepsilon < 0$$

for initial data given in a small neighborhood of $\mathcal{S}$. It then follows that

$$E(u_{k-1}) < -J(W) + \varepsilon < 0,\ k \geqslant 3, \tag{3.2}$$

on account of $E(u_{j+1}) < E(u_j)$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. But then the classical argument of Levine [12] (or also the argument below, based on that of Levine) predicts the onset of finite-time singularities for solutions associated with data $u_{k-1}[T_{k-1}]$, giving a contradiction.

To prove the theorem, it thus suffices to prove that we cannot have a weak solution with either $T_2 = +\infty$, or else infinitely many concentration times T_i and $\lim_{i\to\infty} T_i = +\infty$. To achieve this, we exploit the virial type functional used in [9]: Thus for some large $\tau > 0$ to be fixed later, and a cutoff $\chi \in C_0^\infty([0,\infty))$ with $\chi|_{[0,1]} = 1$, we set

$$w(t,x) = \chi\Big(\frac{|x|}{t+\tau}\Big), \quad y(t) := \langle w(t,\cdot)\tilde{u}(t,\cdot), \tilde{u}(t,\cdot)\rangle,$$

Here the spatial L^2 pairing $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is well-defined as long as $\tilde{u} \in \dot{H}^1$, due to Sobolev's embedding and the cutoff. This is definitely the case on each interval $I_j := (T_{i-1}, T_i)$. In fact, from [9], we have that $y(t), \dot{y}(t), \ddot{y}(t)$ are continuous functions on each open interval I_j. Now let $\tilde{u}$ be a weak solution as above with $T_{\text{terminal}} = +\infty$.

Lemma 3.2. *The functions $y(t), \dot{y}(t)$, and $\ddot{y}(t)$ extend continuously to $\mathbb{R}_+$.*

Proof. Recall first the representation for $\tilde{u}$ from its definition

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{u}(t,\cdot) - \Bigg[\sum_{k=1}^{N_i} \kappa_k^{(i)} W_{\lambda_k^{(i)}(t)}(\cdot) + u_{i+1}(t,\cdot)\Bigg] \xrightarrow[t\nearrow T_{i+1}]{\dot{H}^1} 0\ , \\ &\tilde{u}_t(t,\cdot) - u_{i+1,t}(T_{i+1},\cdot) \xrightarrow[t\nearrow T_{i+1}]{L^2} 0\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Now observe that with a finite radius cutoff

$$\int_{|x|<R} W_\lambda^2 \,\mathrm{d}x = 4\pi \int_0^R \frac{\lambda r^2}{1+\lambda^2 r^2/3}\,\mathrm{d}r \leqslant \frac{12\pi R}{\lambda}\ .$$

This implies that for each $\lambda_k^{(i)}$ we have

$$\sqrt{w} W_{\lambda_k^{(i)}(t)} \xrightarrow[t\nearrow T_{i+1}]{L^2} 0$$

and hence

$$\lim_{t\nearrow T_{i+1}} \langle w\tilde{u}, \tilde{u}\rangle = \langle w u_{i+1}, u_{i+1}\rangle|_{t=T_{i+1}}$$

showing the continuity of $y(t)$.

For the derivatives, we follow the computations in [9]. In particular, observe that

$$\dot{y}(t) = \langle \dot{w}\tilde{u} + 2w\dot{\tilde{u}}, \tilde{u}\rangle$$

provided $t \in [T_i, T_{i+1})$. Now, the same argument as above shows that using the uniformly bounded support of $\dot{w}$ and w near T_{i+1},

$$\lim_{t\nearrow T_{i+1}} \langle \dot{w}\tilde{u}, \tilde{u}\rangle = \langle \dot{w} u_{i+1}, u_{i+1}\rangle|_{t=T_{i+1}}\ .$$

Together with the L^2 convergence of $w\tilde{u} \to u_{i+1}(T_{i+1})$ and $\dot{\tilde{u}} \to u_{i+1,t}(T_{i+1})$ as $t \nearrow T_{i+1}$ we get

$$\lim_{t\nearrow T_{i+1}} \dot{y}(t) = \big\langle \dot{w}u_{i+1}(T_{i+1},\cdot) + 2wu_{i+1,t}(T_{i+1},\cdot),\, u_{i+1}(T_{i+1},\cdot)\big\rangle .$$

Since $\tilde{u}|_{[T_{i+1},T_{i+2})} = u_{i+1}$, the continuity of $\dot{y}(t)$ across $t = T_{i+1}$ is evident. Next, consider $\ddot{y}(t)$, which according to [9] is given by the expression

$$\ddot{y}(t) = \big\langle 2w,\, \dot{\tilde{u}}^2 - |\nabla\tilde{u}|^2 + \tilde{u}^6\big\rangle + \langle \ddot{w}\tilde{u},\, \tilde{u}\rangle + \langle 4\dot{w}\tilde{u},\, \dot{\tilde{u}}\rangle - 2\langle \tilde{u}\nabla w,\, \nabla\tilde{u}\rangle,\ t \in I_{i+1}\,. \quad (3.4)$$

The continuity of the middle two terms at times T_{i+1} is obtained exactly as shown previously. For the last term, in addition to the representation formulae (3.3) above we use also the fact that the derivative ∇w has compact spatial support uniformly (near $t = T_{i+1}$) *away* from the origin and so kills the contributions from $\nabla W_{\lambda_k^{(i)}}(t)$.

We examine the remaining term. The convergence in L^2 of $\dot{\tilde{u}}$ to $\dot{u}_{i+1}$ as $t \nearrow T_{i+1}$ implies

$$\lim_{t\nearrow T_{i+1}} \big\langle 2w(t,\cdot),\, \dot{\tilde{u}}^2(t,\cdot)\big\rangle = \big\langle 2w,\, u_{i+1,t}^2(T_{i+1},\cdot)\big\rangle .$$

The expressions $\langle 2w, |\nabla\tilde{u}|^2\rangle$ and $\langle 2w, \tilde{u}^6\rangle$ must be taken together as they *do not individually extend continuously across* T_{i+1}. Their difference, however, does. Indeed, it is straightforward to check that

$$\lim_{t\nearrow T_{i+1}} \big\langle 2w,\, |\nabla h_i|^2 - h_i^6\big\rangle = 0, \quad h_i(t,\cdot) := \sum_{k=1}^{N_i} \kappa_k^{(i)} W_{\lambda_k^{(i)}(t)}$$

where we exploit of course the fact that W is the ground state, i.e. $\triangle W + W^5 = 0$, as well as the fact that the solitons separate in scale, i.e. $\lambda_{k-1}^{(i)} \ll \lambda_k^{(i)}$. It follows that

$$\lim_{t\nearrow T_{i+1}} \big\langle 2w,\, -|\nabla\tilde{u}|^2 + \tilde{u}^6\big\rangle = \big\langle 2w,\, -|\nabla u_{i+1}|^2 + u_{i+1}^6\big\rangle|_{t=T_{i+1}}\,.$$

The fact that $\ddot{y}(t)$ extends continuously across T_{i+1} follows easily. □

We now continue with the proof of Theorem 3.1, following the method of [9]. The functional

$$y(t) = \big\langle w(t)\tilde{u}(t,\cdot),\, \tilde{u}(t,\cdot)\big\rangle$$

extends as a twice continuously differentiable function to $[0,\infty)$. We argue through the convexity properties of $y(t)$. As in [9], observe that

$$\ddot{y}(t) = 2\big(4\|\dot{\tilde{u}}\|_{L^2}^2 + 4\|\nabla\tilde{u}\|_{L^2}^2 - 6E(\tilde{u})\big) + O(E_{\mathrm{ext}}) \quad (3.5)$$

where we write

$$E_{\mathrm{ext}}(t) := \int_{|x|>t+\tau} \big(|\dot{u}|^2 + |\nabla u|^2\big)\,dx \lesssim E_{\mathrm{ext}}(0)$$

via a continuity argument and Huygens' principle as in [9]. By picking the initial cutoff $\tau > 0$ sufficiently large, we can force $E_{\mathrm{ext}}(0) \ll 1$ as small as we want. Fix $0 < \varepsilon_* \ll E(W)$.

First we consider the case that more than 1 soliton has 'bubbled off'. This would be any $t \in [T_2,\infty)$ for a finite T_2 time, or for any $t \in [T_1,\infty)$ when more than 1 soliton appeared at time T_1. Then by taking ε sufficiently small in the initial data, the energy bound (3.2) implies $E(\tilde{u})(t) < -\frac{1}{2}E(W)$ and so (3.5) implies

$$\ddot{y}(t) \geqslant 8\|\dot{\tilde{u}}\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon_* \tag{3.6}$$

provided τ is chosen sufficiently large.

Next we consider the case that exactly 1 soliton has come off at T_1. That is, we can write

$$u(t,\cdot) \approx \kappa W_{\lambda(t)} + u_1(t,\cdot)\ ,\ \kappa \in \{\pm 1\},\ t \in [0, T_1)\ .$$

For $t \in [T_1, T_2)$, the energy satisfies

$$E(\tilde{u})(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \big(\frac{1}{2}(\tilde{u}_t)^2 + |\nabla \tilde{u}|^2\big) - \frac{1}{6}\tilde{u}^6\big)\, dx < \varepsilon\ ,$$

and by using Sobolev's inequality we get that for some constant $C_* > 0$

$$\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla\tilde{u}\|_{L^2}^2 - C_*\|\nabla\tilde{u}\|_{L^2}^6 < \varepsilon$$

which implies that if the constant ε (which we recall measures how much above the manifold $\mathcal{S}$ sits our initial data in energy space) is chosen sufficiently small, by continuity we must have that throughout $t \in [T_1, T_2)$, either

$$\|\nabla\tilde{u}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon}$$

or

$$\|\nabla\tilde{u}\|_{L^2} \gtrsim 1\ .$$

The first case would necessarily require a bound

$$\|\tilde{u}_t\|_{L^2} \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon}$$

which implies that

$$\|\nabla_{t,x} u_1(T_1,\cdot)\|_{L^2_x} \lesssim \sqrt{\varepsilon}$$

which contradicts the ejection lemma from [9] at times shortly before T_1. It follows that

$$\|\nabla\tilde{u}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2} \gtrsim 1,\ t \in [T_1, T_2)\ .$$

Looking at (3.5) again we see that if ε_* is chosen sufficiently small and τ sufficiently large, and if ε is also sufficiently small, the expression (3.6) would also apply in $[T_1, T_2)$.

Now note that (3.6) establishes a lower bound on $\ddot{y}$ in $[T_1, \infty)$, which implies that after some large finite time $\dot{y} > 0$ and $y > y_0$ is bounded below. Hence if one remarks just as in [9] that by Cauchy-Schwartz

$$|\dot{y}(t)| = 2\langle w\dot{\tilde{u}}, \tilde{u}\rangle + O(E_{\text{ext}}) \leqslant 2\sqrt{y}\|\dot{\tilde{u}}\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + O(E_{\text{ext}})$$

we have that at all sufficiently late times past T_1 we can upgrade (3.6) to

$$\ddot{y}(t) \geqslant \frac{3}{2}\frac{\dot{y}^2}{y} + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_*\ . \tag{3.7}$$

From this inequality, however, we can apply the exact same argument as in [9]: (3.7) implies that $\frac{\mathrm{d}^2}{\mathrm{d}t^2}y^{-\frac{1}{2}} < 0$ at all $t > T_1$ sufficiently large; that $\dot{y}, y > 0$ implies that $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}y^{-\frac{1}{2}} < 0$ at all $t > T_1$ sufficiently large. Together the concavity implies $y(t)$

must blow up in finite time, ruling out the possibility $T_{\text{terminal}} = +\infty$ and proving Theorem 3.1. □

REFERENCES

[1] R. Donninger, J. Krieger *Nonscattering solutions and blow up at infinity for the critical wave equation.* preprint, arXiv: 1201.3258v1

[2] Donninger, R., Schörkhuber, B., *Stable blow up dynamics for energy supercritical wave equations*, preprint, arXiv: 1207.7046v1, to appear in Transactions of the AMS.

[3] T. Duyckaerts, C. Kenig, F. Merle (MR2781926) *Universality of blow-up profile for small radial type II blow-up solutions of energy-critical wave equation,* J. Eur. Math. Soc., no. 3, **13** (2011), 533–599.

[4] T. Duyckaerts, C. Kenig, F. Merle *Universality of the blow-up profile for small type II blow-up solutions of energy-critical wave equation: the non-radial case,* preprint, arXiv:1003.0625, to appear in JEMS.

[5] T. Duyckaerts, C. Kenig, F. Merle *Profiles of bounded radial solutions of the focusing, energy-critical wave equation*, preprint, arXiv:1201.4986, to appear in GAFA.

[6] T. Duyckaerts, C. Kenig, F. Merle *Classification of radial solutions of the focusing, energy-critical wave equation*, preprint, arXiv:1204.0031.

[7] T. Duyckaerts, F. Merle (MR2470571) *Dynamic of threshold solutions for energy-critical wave equation.* Int. Math. Res. Pap. IMRP (2008)

[8] C. Kenig, F. Merle (MR2461508) *Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy-critical focusing non-linear wave equation.* Acta Math., no. 2, **201** (2008), 147–212.

[9] J. Krieger, K. Nakanishi, W. Schlag *Global dynamics away from the ground state for the energy-critical nonlinear wave equation*, to appear in Amer. Journal Math.

[10] J. Krieger, K. Nakanishi, W. Schlag *Threshold phenomenon for the quintic wave equation in three dimensions*, preprint 2012, available on arxiv.

[11] J. Krieger, W. Schlag, D. Tataru (MR2494455) *Slow blow-up solutions for the* $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *critical focusing semilinear wave equation.* Duke Math. J., no. 1, **147** (2009), 1–53.

[12] H. A. Levine (MR 0344697) *Instability and nonexistence of global solutions to nonlinear wave equations of the form* $Pu_{tt} = -Au + \mathcal{F}(u)$, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **192** (1974), 1–21.

[13] J. Shatah, M. Struwe *Well-posedness in the energy space for semi-linear wave equations with critical growth.* IMRN **No.7**(1994), 303-309.

JOACHIM KRIEGER

Bâtiment des Mathématiques, EPFL
Station 8, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
joachim.krieger@epfl.ch

WILLIE WONG

Bâtiment des Mathématiques, EPFL
Station 8, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
willie.wong@epfl.ch